

## **REMARKS**

**[0001]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-19 and 21-26 are presently pending. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10-14, 16-19 and 21-25 are herein amended. Claims 9 and 20 are herein cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

### **Formal Request for an Interview**

**[0002]** If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

**[0003]** Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

### **Claim Amendments**

**[0004]** Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10-14, 16-19 and 21-25 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. These amendments are fully supported by the Application and are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

## **Substantive Matters**

### **Claim Rejections under § 102 and § 103**

**[0005]** Claims 1-2 and 4-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103 for being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,964,836 to Rowe et al. (“Rowe”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,115,040 to Bladow et al. (“Bladow”). In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

**[0006]** Independent claim 1, as amended, recites (in part with emphasis added):

a first set of application programming interfaces, implemented and executed by the computing device, configured to support execution of the navigation-based web application within the software architecture, *wherein the navigation-based web application comprises:*

*multiple web pages expressed in declarative languages and hyperlinked together;*

a plurality of resources distributed to the multiple web pages, the plurality of resources each having state information reflecting its current state; and

*one or more business logic within an extent of the navigation-based web application, the one or more business logic being applied to the multiple web pages and the plurality of resources of the navigation-based web application*

**[0007]** Applicant respectfully submits that at least the emphasized features are not disclosed, taught or suggested in Rowe.

**[0008]** Rowe teaches managing session with a host-based application by embedding a user interface, such as a screen, for a first session between the remote computer and the application in a Web page displayed at a remote computer. According to Rowe, a Java applet is downloaded to the remote computer and processed to embed the user interface. The downloaded Java applet may also be processed to establish the first session between the remote computer and the application in a first window, and then establish a second session with a user interface in a second window.

**[0009]** As discussed during the interview, the Java applet in Rowe is not the navigation-based web application recited in claim 1. In fact, many features specific to the navigation-based web application are not taught or disclosed in Rowe. For example, the Java applet in Rowe is to embed a user interface of an application, which is executed on a host computer (See Fig. 2) and does not include (1) “multiple web pages expressed in declarative language and hyperlinked together,” (2) “one or more business logic ... applied to the multiple web pages and the plurality of resources of the navigation-based web application.” Indeed, Rowe merely teaches using a Java applet to create a session and embed a user interface of a remote application within the session. It is known in the art that a Java applet is not written in “declarative language” and that an embedded Java applet cannot extend its own rule/logic to multiple web pages outside the Java applet. In fact, a Java applet is written in Java programming language that requires proper compilation before execution. Therefore, a Java applet as disclosed in Rowe shall not be interpreted as a “navigation-based web application” as recited in amended claim 1.

**[0010]** Moreover, other features in amended claim 1 are missing in Rowe. Claim 1 further recites:

a second set of application programming interfaces, implemented and executed by the computing device, configured to support navigation-related activities of the navigation-based web application, wherein...

*the navigation-related activities are activities arising from navigation among the multiple pages of the navigation-based web application;*

**[0011]** Rowe does not teach the emphasized feature. Rowe merely teaches embedding user interface to embedded session in a web page. Rowe is completely silent with respect to navigation-related activities “arising from navigation among the multiple pages of the navigation-based web application.”

**[0012]** Furthermore, the following claimed features are absent in Rowe:

the state information of each of the plurality of resources of the navigation-based web application is:

*persisted within the navigation-based web application object;*

*made accessible to the plurality of other resources within the navigation-based web application; and*

*modified according to the one or more business logic in response to an occurrence of the navigation-related activities during a session of the navigation-based web application*

**[0013]** In fact, Rowe has no mention of any of the above emphasized features.

**[0014]** Accordingly, independent claim 1, as amended, is respectfully asserted patentably distinct from Rowe.

**[0015]** Independent claims 16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe and Bladow. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

**[0016]** Claims 16 and 19 are amended to incorporate features similar to claim 1. For example, each of these claims recites a “navigation-based web application” with associated features. Bladow, however, does not remedy the deficiencies of Rowe.

**[0017]** Bladow teaches an integrated system of user interfaces for communicating with remote service. In particular, Bladow provides a backplane architecture that controls and manages the user interfaces by instantiating, launching, overseeing and closing the user interfaces associated with a plurality of applications residing in a remote server. According to Bladow, a backplane object is downloaded with and launched by a web page, and is capable of launching client application programs and enabling inter-application communications among the client application programs and also with the backplane object.

**[0018]** Bladow is completely silent with respect to the “navigation-based web application” and associated features as recited in claim 1. Bladow merely teaches using a

web page as a host to launch a backplane object, which in turn launches client application programs in a remote server.

**[0019]** Accordingly, claims 16 and 19 are respectfully asserted patentable over Rowe and Bladow either alone or in combination.

*Dependent Claims 2, 4-8, 10-15, 17, 18 and 21-26*

**[0020]** These claims ultimately depend upon one of the independent claims 1, 16 and 19. As discussed above, claims 1, 16 and 19 are allowable over cited references. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable over the cited references. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

**[0021]** For example, claimed features, “a set of events related to an occurrence of a navigation by the navigation-based web application,” and the set of events comprising navigating event indicative of initiation, completion of the navigation, as recited in dependent claims 11-13 and 22-24, are also absent in Rowe and Bladow. Examiner rejected these claims based on Java programming language specification provided in Rowe. As provided above, since the “navigation-based web application” recited in various independent claims shall not be interpreted as a Java applet, these rejections based on Java language shall not apply to claims 11-13 and 22-24.

**[0022]** Similarly, features including “StartingUp method” and “ShutDown method” as recited in claims 2 and 4 are absent in Rowe and Bladow. Examiner rejected these claims based on Bladow in col.13, lines 1-45. Bladow at col.13, line 32 indicates that “COBackPlane 52 is generally implemented as a Java applet and is launched by the

Web browser 14...When the backplane is implemented as an applet, it overrides standard Applet methods init (), start (), stop () and run ()..." As argued above, since the "navigation-based web application" recited in various independent claims shall not be interpreted as a Java applet, these rejections based on a Java applet shall not apply to claims 2 and 4.

### **Conclusion**

**[0023]** All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

/Ningning Xu Reg. No. L0293/

Dated: 2008-12-18

Ningning Xu ([ningning@leehayes.com](mailto:ningning@leehayes.com); (509) 944-4726)  
Registration No. L0293

Bea Koempel-Thomas ([bea@leehayes.com](mailto:bea@leehayes.com); (509) 944-4759)  
Registration No. 58,213  
Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256  
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)